**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-13 and 16-19 remain in the application. Claims 14-15 have been previously cancelled.

In item 1 on pages 2-3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-13, and 16-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Tool et al. (6,696,879 B1), Maclellan et al. (US 5,940,006), Barham et al. (US 5,432,813) and admitted prior art.

In item 2 on page 4 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 2 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Tool et al., Maclellan et al., and Barham et al. and further in view of Anderson (US 4,868,915).

In item 3 on page 4 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 6 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Tool et al., Maclellan et al., and Barham et al. and further in view of Lanzi (US 6,353,406).

In item 4 on page 5 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over O'Tool et al., Maclellan et al. and Barham et al. and further in view of Tu et al. (US 5,682,403).

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, inter alia:

> outputting with the transceiver unit the interrogation signal configured to activate all the access code transmitters within a reception area at the same time;
>
> transmitting with all of the access code transmitters receiving the interrogation signal a respectively specific access code signal superimposed with a specific spread spectrum sequence, substantially simultaneously; and
>
> receiving the access code signals with the transceiver unit substantially simultaneously, and parallel processing and separating the access code signals on a basis of specific spread spectrum sequences applied to the signals for speeding up the process and guaranteeing a higher security against interception.

Claim 8 calls for, inter alia:

> a transceiver unit having:
>
> > an interrogation signal transmitter for generating and transmitting an interrogation signal configured

> to activate all access code transmitters within a reception area at the same time; and
>
> a receiver for receiving access code signals simultaneously, said receiver having at least one section with a device for parallel processing and separating of a plurality of simultaneously received access code signals in accordance with specific spread spectrum sequences superimposed on the access code signals for speeding up the process and guaranteeing a higher security against interception;
>
> ...
>
> said plurality of access code transmitters each being a portable code transmitter with a transponder or a sending and receiving unit, and said plurality of access code transmitters transmitting the superimposed access code signals substantially simultaneously.

The Examiner has stated in the final Office action as well as in previous Office actions that O'Tool et al. disclose a system having an interrogator sending an interrogation signal and a transceiver responding to the interrogation signal by sending an access code. The Examiner has further stated that each transceiver responds "simultaneously" using different spreading codes as recited in the independent claims of the instant application. The Examiner has cited col. 29, lines 39+ of O'Tool et al. for such a "simultaneous" response.

However, as discussed in the Applicants' responses to the previous Office actions, according to col. 19, lines 39+ of O'Tool et al. the responses of the transceivers or devices 12 are not simultaneous, but in a serial manner, namely one at a

time, after addressing a certain device having a certain arbitration number by the interrogator 26 (see column 29, line 51).

Furthermore, the Examiner has stated that Maclellan et al. show a plurality of transceivers, which respond to an interrogator. As already discussed in the response to the previous Office action, the interrogator sends a first radio signal to the tag and each tag receives and transmits, in a time-slotted manner, a second modulated signal back to the interrogator. Consequently, in Maclellan et al. the second modulated signals are not transmitted by the transponders or received by the transceivers "simultaneously."

Finally, the Examiner has stated that Barham et al. show a receiver, which can process a received signal in parallel. However, although the received signals may contain spread sequence, Barham et al. do not disclose the simultaneous transmission of several code signals that are also received and processed simultaneously by an interrogator. On the contrary, Barham et al. disclose that a signal is received and serially fed to a serial-to-parallel converter so that the received signals can be processed in parallel (see also the last paragraph on page 12 of the Applicants' response dated

September 10, 2003 in response to the Office action dated May 21, 2003).

The Examiner has stated in the third paragraph on page 5 of the final Office action that Applicants did not address the Barham et al. reference. However, as mentioned above, Applicants has already addressed the Barham et al. reference more than two years ago in the last paragraph on page 12 of the Applicants' response dated September 10, 2003 in response to the Office action dated May 21, 2003.

In addition, Applicants note that the Examiner's final Office action is almost like a repetition of the previous Office action dated July 27, 2005. The Examiner has cited certain passages from the references without analyzing how exactly each feature of the claims of the instant application is disclosed by the prior art references.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 and 8, especially the feature that each of the access code transmitters simultaneously transmits a respective specific access code signal to the transceiver unit and that the access code signals are received and processed simultaneously. Claims 1

and 8 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claims 1 or 8, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-13 and 16-19 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Yonghong Chen
Reg. No. 56,150

For Applicants

YC

March 31, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101